



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,856	06/14/2006	James C. Barrow	21592YP	4989
210	7590	02/22/2008		
MERCK AND CO., INC			EXAMINER	
P O BOX 2000			DAVIS, ZINNA NORTHWORTHINGTON	
RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/582,856	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BARROW ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Zinna Northington Davis	<b>Art Unit</b> 1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,13,15, 16, and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-12,14 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1468)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0/14/06; 2/7/08
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-17 and 19 are pending.
2. Claims 18 and 20 have been canceled.
3. The Preliminary Amendment filed June 14, 2006 has been entered and considered.
4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the inhibition of  $\beta$ -secretase or BACE does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease using a chemical compound of formula I. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been described. They are:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

### **The Nature of the Invention**

The nature of the invention in the claims is drawn to the treatment for Alzheimer's disease using a compound of formula I.

### **The State of the Prior Art**

The state of the prior art teaches that certain compounds are useful in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease. See pages 1 and 2, of the specification.

### **The predictability or lack thereof in the art**

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below:

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art may not recognize that in regards to therapeutic agents that can inhibit  $\beta$ -secretase or BACE may be useful in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease.

There is no showing of correlation between the inhibition of  $\beta$ -secretase or BACE and the treatment of Alzheimer's disease with all chemical compounds of formula (I). One of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound of formula (I).

The nature of the pharmaceutical art is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities.

There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

**The amount of direction or guidance present**

The direction present in the instant specification is that the compounds of claim 1 can inhibition of  $\beta$ -secretase or BACE. The specification is silent and fails to provide guidance as to what compounds treat Alzheimer's disease. The specification fails to provide a correlation between the disease and the chemical compounds of formula I. See pages 35 and 36, wherein the data in the specification teaches the inhibition of  $\beta$ -secretase not the treatment of Alzheimer's disease as claimed.

**The presence or absence of working examples**

The presence of working examples is limited to how to make the instant claimed compounds. There is no correlation between the disease and chemical compounds of formula I.

**The quantity of experimentation needed**

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in the art would need to determine the inhibition of  $\beta$ -secretase or BACE that would be benefited. Furthermore, one of skill in the art would then have to determine whether the claimed compounds would provide treatment of the disease.

**The level of the skill in the art**

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by *in vitro* and *in vivo* screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and *In re Fisher* (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which chemical compounds can treat the disease encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

At claims 1, 13, 15, and 16, it is suggested that the phrase "and pharmaceutically acceptable salts" should be amended to read as "or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt".

7. Claims 2-12, 14, and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The Information Disclosure Statements filed June 14, 2006 and February 7, 2008 have been considered. The references alone or in combination forms do not teach nor suggest the structurally similar compounds as those instantly claimed. There is no motivation to modify the prior art compounds to derive those as claimed. Accordingly, no rejections based upon prior art are made.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zinna Northington Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0682.

10. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Zinna Northington Davis/  
**Zinna Northington Davis**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1625**